REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 9-16 and 17-20 are pending in the present application. By this response, claims 1-8 and 17 are canceled, claims 9, 14, 16, and 18 are amended, and claims 21 and 22 are added. Claims 9 and 14 are amended to recite "A method, in a data processing system, ..." Claim 16 is amended to incorporate the subject matter of presently canceled claim 17. Claims 21 and 22 are added and recite subject matter similar to canceled claims 5 and 6. Reconsideration of the claims in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed towards non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-8 are canceled. Claims 9 and 16 are amended to recite a method in a data processing system of verifying a categorization of a service in a taxonomy. Furthermore, claim 9 is amended to recite receiving a request at the data processing system to delete a directory entry, responsive to a search by the data processing system for directory entries that satisfy a search query, excluding tagged directory entries from search results that otherwise satisfy the search query, and deleting by the data processing system references to the tagged directory entries throughout the set of database tables. Claims 14 is amended to recite receiving a search query at the data processing system, responsive to a search by the data processing system for directory entries that satisfy the search query, excluding given directory entries from search results that otherwise satisfy the search query, wherein a given directory entry is a directory entry that has been tagged for deletion by setting an attribute of the given directory entry to a predetermined value, and returning by the data processing system the search results. Applicants respectfully submit that searching by the data processing system for directory entries that satisfy a search query is statutory.

Claims 16 recites "A computer program product in a computer-readable medium for deleting entries from a directory in which directory information is stored in a set of database tables." Applicants respectfully submit that a computer program product in a computer-readable medium is statutory.

Claim 19 recites "A directory service, comprising: a directory organized as a naming hierarchy having a plurality of entries each represented by a unique identifier; a relational database management system having a backing store for storing directory data in a set of database entries." Applicants respectfully submit that a directory service comprised of a directory and a relational database management system is statutory.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 9, 14, 16, and 19 are statutory. Since claims 10-13, 15, and 18 depend from claims 9, 14, and 16, they are statutory as well. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Alleged Obviousness, Claims 1-3, 7, 8, and 16

The Office rejects claims 1-3, 7, 8, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Peters et al.,* Integrated Directory Services, U.S. Patent No. 6,377,950 B1, April 23, 2002 (hereinafter "*Peters*") in view of *Gallant*, Method for Controlling Query and Update Processing in a Database System, U.S. Patent No. 4,648,036, March 3, 1987 (hereinafter "*Gallant*"). By this response, claims 1-3, 7, and 8 have been canceled and claim 16 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 17, which is rejected under *Peters* in view of *Gallant* and further in view of *Lee et al.*, Address Learning System and Method for Using Same, U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0054031 A1, December 20, 2001 (hereinafter "*Lee*"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present application was filed April 29, 1999. The applied *Lee* reference, U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0054031 A1, is a non-provisional application of provisional application number 60/178,450, filed January 27, 2000.

35 U.S.C. § 103, reads as follows:

> 35 U.S.C. § 103 Conditions for patentability; non-obvious subject matter.
> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described **as set forth in section 102 of this title**, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the **prior art** are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made. (emphasis added)

Thus, the art cited in a 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection must first be prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

35 U.S.C. 102 (a), (b), and (e), reads as follows:

> 35 U.S.C. § 102 Conditions for patentability; novelty and loss of right to patent.
> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless —
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, **before** the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, **more than one year prior** to the date of the application for patent in the United States, or
> (e) the invention was described in — (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States **before** the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States **before** the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an

> international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for the purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language; or. (emphasis added)

Since the *Lee* reference was filed after April 29, 1999, the *Lee* reference does not fall under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and, thus, is not prior art. Therefore, the rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is improper and should be withdrawn.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Alleged Obviousness, Claims 4, 9-13, and 17-20

The Examiner has rejected claims 4, 9-13, and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Peters* in view of *Gallant* and further in view of *Lee*. By this response claim 4 has been canceled. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, since the *Lee* reference was filed after April 29, 1999, the *Lee* reference does not fall under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and, thus, is not prior art. Therefore, the rejection of claims 9-13 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is improper and should be withdrawn.

IV. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Alleged Obviousness, Claims 14 and 15

The Examiner has rejected claims 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lee* in view of *Gallant*. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, since the *Lee* reference was filed after April 29, 1999, the *Lee* reference does not fall under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and, thus, is not prior art. Therefore, the rejection of claims 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is improper and should be withdrawn.

V. New Claims

Claims 21 and 22 are added to the pending application. Claims 21 and 22 are similar to claims 5 and 6. Consequently, no new matter is added.

VI. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the cited references and is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: December 12, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

/Francis Lammes/

Francis Lammes
Reg. No. 55,353
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Agent for Applicants